

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 5, 2006, has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-30 have been canceled and new claims 31-54 have been added. Claims 31-54 are pending in the application.

In paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-19 and 21-25 were objected to.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the claims, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled claims 1-30 and added new claims 31-54 thereby rendering the objection moot.

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 8-13 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the claims, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled claims 1-30 and added new claims 31-54 thereby rendering the objection moot.

In paragraph 6 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 5, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the claims, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled claims 1-30 and added new claims 31-54 thereby rendering the objection moot.

In paragraph 7 on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the claims, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled claims 1-30 and added new claims 31-54 thereby rendering the objection moot.

In paragraph 9 on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 8-10, 12-16, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Vessey et al.

In paragraph 21 on pages 8 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman et al. in view of Vessey et al.

In paragraph 29 on pages 10 of the Office Action, claims 20-22 and 24-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tummalapalli in view of Vessey et al.

In paragraph 36 on pages 12 of the Office Action, claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tummalapalli in view of Vessey et al. and further in view of Goodman et al.

In paragraph 38 on pages 13 of the Office Action, claims 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vessey et al. in view of Goodman et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled claims 1-30 and added new claims 31-54. Applicants respectfully submit that Vessey et al. Goodman et al. and Tummalapalli et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations presented in the new claims.

Applicants' invention, for example as presented by claim 31, provides for asynchronous (non-blocking) interprocess communication between processes. A portion of memory is configured to provide asynchronous, connectionless inter-process communication between a first process and a second processes. Exclusive access is granted to a first process to the portion of memory. While exclusive access, the first process accesses the portion of memory to modify the

contents thereof to provide a message for processing by the second process. Exclusive access by the first process to the portion of memory is released to prevent inter-process communication between the first and second process from becoming a performance bottleneck. The release of exclusive access of the portion of memory by the first process releases resources of the first process. Accordingly, communication between processes is provided in a manner that is asynchronous and thus does not present a bottleneck. Independent claims 37, 43 and 49-54 provide similar limitations.

In contrast, Vessey et al. disclose providing a connection between a first partition and a second partition using a memory region of a computer system. However, by requiring a connection between the first partition and the second partition, a bottleneck could occur because the connection between the first partition and the second partition is maintained. For example, Vessey et al. discloses one embodiment that uses socket protocols to provide a socket connection. Nevertheless, maintaining a connection ties up finite resources of applications that maintain a connection between them.

In addition, Vessey et al. does not disclose allowing exclusive access to shared memory by a partition. Rather, Vessey et al. discloses a lock mechanism. However, the lock mechanism merely limits modification of any given structure, page or table to only one partition. Nevertheless, dictating how only one partition owns and therefore may change the content of the shared memory is different from providing exclusive access to the shared memory. Vessey et al. merely provides read access to the message queue to a partition that does not own the message queue.

Still further, the lock mechanism disclosed by Vessey et al. teaches away from providing asynchronous interprocess communication. Vessey et al. provides a message queue area that is

divided into n node output queues, each of which is dedicated to a different partition. However, a particular partition can only modify its associated node output queue.

Vessey et al. also fails to suggest releasing exclusive access by a first process to allow a second process to then obtain exclusive access to the same portion of memory and change the contents of the portion of memory, e.g., by providing results to the message left in the portion of memory by the first process. Again, Vessey et al. does not allow a partition that does not have ownership of a portion of the memory to alter the contents of that memory.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 31, 37, 43 and 49-54 are patentable over Vessey et al.

Goodman et al. fail to overcome the deficiencies of Vessey et al. Goodman et al. is merely cited as disclosing a program storage device for providing access to a mailbox and a remote procedure call. However, Goodman et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest providing a portion of memory configured to provide asynchronous, connectionless inter-process communication between a first process and a second processes. Goodman also fails to disclose or suggest allowing exclusive access to shared memory by a partition. Goodman also fails to suggest releasing exclusive access by a first process to allow a second process to then obtain exclusive access to the same portion of memory and change the contents of the portion of memory, e.g., by providing results to the message left in the portion of memory by the first process.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 31, 37, 43 and 49-54 are patentable over Vessey et al. and Goodman et al.

Tummalapalli fails to overcome the deficiencies of Vessey et al. and Goodman et al. Tummalapalli is cited as disclosing a Service Level Agreement (SLA) server. However,

Tummalapalli fails to disclose, teach or suggest providing a portion of memory configured to provide asynchronous, connectionless inter-process communication between a first process and a second processes. Tummalapalli also fails to disclose or suggest allowing exclusive access to shared memory by a partition. Tummalapalli also fails to suggest releasing exclusive access by a first process to allow a second process to then obtain exclusive access to the same portion of memory and change the contents of the portion of memory, e.g., by providing results to the message left in the portion of memory by the first process.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 31, 37, 43 and 49-54 are patentable over Vessey et al., Goodman et al. and Tummalapalli


Dependent claims 32-36, 38-42 and 44-48 are also patentable over the cited reference, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 31, 37 and 43. Further dependent claims 32-36, 38-42 and 44-48 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 32-36, 38-42 and 44-48 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By: 
Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204